

1962

11

15

SP-SDF
64 E Van Buren
Room 810
Chicago, Illinois

DISCUSSION
BULLETIN

SOCIALIST PARTY
S.D.F.

AND

CONTENTS:

| | |
|--|----|
| Resolution on Peace Activity by the Illinois State Convention | 1 |
| Socialist Struggle for Peace by Milton Zatinsky | 2 |
| Draft Resolution on the 1962 Campaign by Milton Zatinsky | 3 |
| Comments on "Let Man Prevail" by Robert Engstrom | 4 |
| On Political Realignment by Max Weinrib | 6 |
| What Kind of Realignment and How ? by Virgil J. Vogel | 9 |
| Building the Socialist Party by Bill Briggs and Arthur Kunkin | 13 |

RESOLUTION ON PEACE ACTIVITY
STATEMENT OF ILLINOIS STATE CONVENTION

1

The world situation today is not encouraging. The Geneva negotiations bogged down long ago and East-West conflicts continue unabated on many fronts. The United States in spite of all its condemnation of Russian testing and its "sincere" desire for peace is currently conducting a new series of nuclear tests while Russia, giving the same lip-service for peace prepares for another series of her own. Mankind spends fantastic fortunes every year to improve the technology of war yet his peaceful uses of that advanced technology lags far behind.

The Illinois Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation recognizes that in this world context the need for developing an effective peace movement is urgent. We realize that if peace is to come about, it will come not from the "good will" of the ruling classes but from the pressures and the commands of the world's role. The rulers of the respective power blocs may be willing to avoid major conflicts from boiling over in order to prevent all-out nuclear war, yet they have shown no intention of pursuing real alternatives to the Cold War. Reports from Geneva indicate that neither the United States nor Russia ever sincerely wanted a test ban treaty since both planned to test at least once more.

The Illinois SP-SDF therefore encourages the development of a grassroots peace movement which genuinely attempts to search out alternatives to the arms race and is not merely a sounding board for the propaganda of either of the major power blocs. Among the organizations in this area which we support are the Chicago Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Student Peace Union, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Committee for Non-Violent Action.

We should not limit our participation in these organizations to walking on picket lines or attending rallies but should take part in political discussions within the organizations to help promote the search for political answers to the problems of peace. A peace movement, if it is to attract a large segment of the population and have some influence on foreign policy, must answer basic political questions such as "How do we deal with the Russians?" and "But, I'll lose my job if we disarm." For this reason we are particularly encouraged that the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has over the past year expanded the scope of its activity, to include all areas of foreign policy.

We recognize that the peace movement will have to engage in political action in the near future if it is ever to achieve a change in foreign policy. Because both major political parties today are committed an essentially militaristic foreign policy, (and refuse to discuss it under the guise of "bipartisanship"), we must force a break in this alliance thru electoral power.

As the peace movement begins to engage in electoral political action, it will find it necessary to seek allies in other liberal movements. It will take a force far greater than the present peace movement alone to defeat the machine and business backed cold-warriors. The peace movement therefore should begin supporting political candidates who have not only a commitment to a minimal peace program, but in addition, support policies that will attract the progressive segments of the labor movement and the civil rights movement.

We urge the peace movement to stay organizationally independent of the two major political parties, and in the most situations to seek to support candidates who are themselves independent of the major parties. In those situations where the peace movement does support a candidate in the Republican or Democratic party, we urge organizations and individuals to avoid committing themselves unreservedly to the party itself. They should not be placed in the position, for example, that in order to support a particular peace candidate effectively, they must also support a Kennedy. The peace movement today is beginning to show possibilities for new growth and influence. It has a staggering task in front of it in order to educate itself and the public, and to grow enough to influence American politics. In these efforts we offer our loyal support and participation.

SOCIALIST STRUGGLE for PEACE
by Milton Zatinsky

2

Democratic Socialists work for a world where peace can be secured with freedom. In its large majority, our international movement is not pacifist. We have supported armed struggles in defense of freedom, such as the cause of the Spanish republic against Franco, the Viennese workers against the fascists, the Hungarian revolutionaries against Russian intervention. Most Socialists supported the resistance of the Ethiopians against Italian aggression, in spite of the archaic nature of the Addas Ababba regime. Many Socialists identify with the fight of the Tibetan people against the Chinese Communist aggression, and many of us are strongly in spirit with the Herbert Matos Brigade working to liberate the Cuban people from the Castro counter-revolution.

Our American Party quite correctly opposed the catastrophe of the first world war and its aftermath which gave rise to modern totalitarianism in Germany, Italy, and Russia. During the 1930's, with the disillusionment from the lofty ideals of Wilsonianism and the revelations of the Nye committee investigating war profiteering, Socialists came close to a semi-pacifist position and were staunch defenders of the Oxford pledge. Some of us have been having second thoughts on our role during this time. While the Party did not oppose U.S. participation in World War II following

Pearl Harbor but developed a position of political non-support, it seems to me that we misjudged this period. If one re-reads our literature of this period, he will see an almost ritualistic devotion to the slogans of the past. The position of Socialists prior to World War I, which stressed international solidarity of workers, was strangely empty in a world that included large totalitarian powers that had ruthlessly suppressed the free worker's movements in their own countries. How could democratic Socialists have hesitated to support the resistance of Socialist-led countries like Norway and Denmark against the drive of Hitlerite armies?

Today, the Socialist international, recognizing the aggressive nature of the Sino-Soviet total states, has firmly committed itself to the defense of Western democracies. It is obvious to most Socialists that, while determination not to buckle under is a necessary pre-condition to achieving breathing time to attempt to avoid the catastrophe of a nuclear war, that new initiatives are necessary in an attempt to disengage the big powers before the momentum of the arms race itself will lead to war by miscalculation.

As contrasted to the appeasement policies of unilateral disarmament suggested by some well-meaning pacifists, thoughtful Socialists are concerned with working out an inspection system that will protect the West from subterfuge. Short of this, we are interested in a policy of disengagement in central Europe, if plans can be worked out so that genuinely nuclear-free zones are established, and not just high-sounding slogans to front for Soviet power advantages.

Realistic Socialists feel that while the major threat to peace comes from the expansion dynamic contained in the totalitarian systems, they are not unmindful of the great appeal of American militarists who, in the Goldwater tradition, are playing on the hurt pride of the American public and the general lack of foreign policy sophistication to ham-string creative thinking by the administration. This they do through building Birch-society-type local pressures to frighten congressmen away from the necessary experimentation and flexibility needed to create a basis for an end to the arms race.

While it seems that no serious realignment is possible on the American scene in the coming period, and that labor and liberal forces are not ready or interested in a serious independent effort except on registration, Socialists must continue a flexible policy of strengthening the liberal-labor-civil rights coalition and working towards the goal of creating the climate and the base that in the future will give voters a clear choice in every congressional district, between progress and reaction.

DRAFT RESOLUTION on the 1962 CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN
by Milton Zatinsky

3

The Democratic and Republican Parties jockeying for advantage in the forth-coming Congressional election offer little hope for those committed to the struggle for broadening our liberties, ending the shame of racial inequality, abolishing poverty and unemployment, improving health and educational standards of the people, or creating the conditions for lasting peace among nations.

The Republican Party, in spite of the lonely efforts of a few individual liberals and independents, remains the party of privilege and big business. Its large majority votes consistently against every effort at social progress, and many of its members continue to make a shameful alliance with the Southern racists to block action in civil rights.

The Democratic Party remains a curious hodge-podge, with a few dedicated liberals working in a Party that includes the worst elements of reaction and racism. In the middle, one finds a broad spectrum including the big city machine politicians, Western moderates, and administration job-holders committed to keeping together this unholy alliance of the worst and the best in American political life.

Every attempt to drive the Southern racists from the Party and turn it into a vehicle for social progress has met with frustration. There is a commitment by the powers in the Party to keep all elements happy as the road to a continued majority in Congress and, they hope, to another victory in 1964 for their presidential candidate.

In spite of this, Democratic Party liberals, with the help of pressure from the labor and progressive forces, have made some real progress during the past two years. Aid to depressed areas, minimum wage legislation, a fight for medical care for the aged, a brake on the efforts of price gouging by the steel industry, are among the worthwhile achievements of the liberal forces, no matter how short of the need the legislation came.

Since there is no independent force of consequence on the national scene, and since the labor and progressive movements are at present content to work within the liberal wings of the old parties, particularly the Democratic Party, it would be meaningless to artificially call for an independent development at this time.

The goals of Socialists in this period would seem to be best served by continuing to work within the progressive, labor and civil rights communities in building up the pressure for more liberal representation and greater concessions on program.

Specifically, the SP-SDF as a party should be prepared to support those few courageous liberals who are leading the fight and who are desirous of our organizational support on either the primary or general election level. As individuals, Socialists, through their COPE, civil rights and community organizations should feel free to work not only for increased labor and minority group registration, but for any decent liberal who will generally support labor, social welfare and civil rights legislation. This does not commit the Party to their campaigns, but it does give Socialists the flexibility to make a contribution through their position in their community organization.

In those individual cases where a meaningful campaign can be waged by an independent liberal, Socialist or trade unionist, Socialists should be ready to lend their support. Care should be taken, when Socialists desire to go an independent road in a constituency, to choose one where an impact can be made and where they will not, in effect, be defeating a genuine liberal running on a major party ticket.

While it seems that no serious realignment is possible on the American scene in the coming period, and that labor and liberal forces are not ready or interested in a serious independent effort except on registration, Socialists must continue a flexible policy of strengthening the liberal-labor-civil rights coalition and working towards the goal of creating the climate and the base that in the future will give voters a clear choice in every congressional district, between progress and reaction.

COMMENTS ON "LET MAN PREDOMINATE"

By Robert Engstrom

As a member of the SP-SDF I wish to register my views on the new Socialist Manifesto by Comrade Erich Fromm, "Let Man Prevail," which has been written as a proposed program for the SP-SDF and which may come before the 1962 National Convention. The article gives us a good analysis of man in society, which should properly be our starting point. The article's strongest section is the description of the sense of alienation which man experiences in modern society. The defense of Marxian socialism as being more than a materialistic cause is also long overdue and is well expressed.

Coming to economic circumstances, I feel that the article understates the power that wealthy majority stockholders exercise in the business structure of the country, both in the present exercise of that power and in the projected democratic society presented, in which stock ownership would continue to reside in their hands. It was in 1955 that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported that less than one per cent of all American families owned over four-fifths of all publicly held stocks owned by individuals. Gabriel Kolko, in his new book, "Wealth and Power in America," describes the corporate executive as "tied to the profit performance of the corporate system in many tangible ways," and also cites the managerial class as "the largest single group in the stock-holding population."

I would submit that corporate ownership is in fact the very essential difference between the liberal and the socialist approaches to the problem of concentrated economic power. Socialist theory has always held that the basis of that power must be transferred en bloc to the public domain where it can function in a consciously directed manner to meet the needs of all the people. This also correctly places the responsibility for that functioning by vesting legal title with the government and the cooperative groups allied with it. The Manifesto as now written would not disturb the existing capitalist property forms for the most part, and would continue the inequities created by the flow of interest and rents to this wealthy elite. This flow of unearned income is the basic source of the capitalists' power. It is, I believe, unrealistic to assume that power and control would remain long divorced under conditions such as these.

Finally, I believe the article misplaces all of the economic tasks of establishing production volume, pricing, and investing. These are not problems which can be solved in the individual enterprises by the workers, clerks, and engineers as stated; these are, indeed, jobs for experts qualified in their field. Workers should have a preponderant voice in the control of their working conditions; consumers should ultimately control the end volume of goods through free choice in a market which they can help to plan; and responsible technicians should balance supply and demand schedules using the most advanced pricing and costing methods available. Much valuable material along these lines is contained in Beckwith's "Economic Theory of a Socialist Economy."

Socialism is above all, however, a moral justification for social ownership of the main instruments of production because, quoting G.D.H. Cole, "this power is the heritage of the present generation from the past." I feel that without some statement to this effect we will not have a truly socialist document. I therefore propose the following additions to the Manifesto. Some statements regarding stockholder control in Chapter 3 should be modified to show the similar identification of top management and major stockholders.

Chapter 5. Add the following after paragraph 12:

13) Humanist socialism means that legal ownership of industry shall become a moral right of ownership based on human labor and social cooperation. Thus moral right is legally sanctioned by the society.

14) Industrial capital wealth, having been created by the cooperative efforts of

labor and an advancing level of social capabilities, should be cooperatively owned and controlled by labor and society as a whole.

15) Humanist socialism thus is the extension of the democratic process beyond the purely political realm, into the economic sphere; it is political and industrial democracy. It is the restoration of political democracy to its original meaning: the true participation of informed citizens in all decisions affecting them.

16) Extension of democracy into the economic sphere means democratic control of the nation's economy through properly-supervised government agencies, participating worker's councils, and effective expression of public opinions and desires. Irresponsible control by managements representing the profit interest of capital must be replaced by administration acting on behalf of, and controlled by, those who produce and consume.

17) The aim of humanist socialism.....(continue original paragraph 15)

Intermediate Goals of Humanist Socialism. Change the first four numbered goals to the following:

I. On the moral principle that ownership follows creation, the great industrial wealth of the nation, built up through the cooperative efforts of the working people, should become collectively owned and controlled by the people, utilizing the most appropriate and democratic forms of ownership possible. Production would be planned through publicly-responsible government agencies to meet the needs of the people as expressed in public-opinion surveys and market purchases.

II. The large industries on which the nation's economy is based would be nationalized, including steel, oil, chemicals, transportation, and banking. The administration of these nationalized industries must follow the principles of democratic, public control as set forth above.

III. Small enterprises should work to the greatest extent possible of a cooperative basis; cooperatives are to be encouraged by taxation and other means. All participants must share in controlling the work process as it affects them.

IV. The autonomy of an enterprise is restricted by publicly-responsible central planning to the extent necessary to make production serve its social ends.

ON POLITICAL REALIGNMENT

- By Max Weinrib

It is almost two years now that the Socialist Party adopted the perspective of political realignment at its 1960 Convention in Washington. Little if anything has been done since that time by the Party to implement that perspective in action. There has been an attempt to hamstring that decision of the convention by an opposition that managed to push thru the convention, another resolution which holds out as a perspective for the Party - "A Labor Party".

This was not posed as a contradictory resolution at the time but since then almost every meeting of the National Committee has been asked to consider that point of view as the official line of the S.P. The two points of view have been counterposed and the resulting confusion has left the Party without a line - without a policy for action in the actual political life of our country.

It is impossible for us to have two lines as an IMMEDIATE perspective. If we decide that our MAIN course NOW should be agitation directed toward the formation of a Labor Party than any talk about realignment is a waste of time. Those who say we can have both positions should know that they are contradictory positions in the CONTEXT OF OUR TIMES and therefore merely serve to confuse and disorient during a period when clarity, not ambiguity, is required to move the Party into the mainstream of political life.

The Party must have A policy, not two. To have no policy, or two or three policies, which is the same thing as no policy, can only serve confusion. It ducks the question.

It is plain to see, for all who have at least one political eye in their head, that the most important progressive developments and manifestations in U.S. politics are today taking place in and around the Democratic Party. To name but a few; the enormously significant grass roots participation in the New York reform movement which resulted in the defeat of Tammany Hall; the defeat of Miriani in the Detroit Mayoralty election; the election of Gonzalez in San Antonio, Texas; the election of Mel Ravitz in the councilmanic elections in Detroit; the evolution of the Democratic Clubs in California. These may be considered as isolated phenomena and of no interest to those who claim that the soil of American politics today need only be sowed with the seed of Labor Party agitation and presto-chango there she is, a full fledged Labor Party. The truth is that even a dose of *gibberellic acid wouldn't do much good for that fruit in this season. These events only indicate that that there is deep ferment and a clash of forces in the Democratic Party. These, and other indications, point to the possibility of deep cleavages between the forces of labor, liberals and civil rights groups on one side and conservatism on the other. The deeper the

*A chemical used experimentally to force rapid and over-sized growth in plants and their fruit but which often ruins the plant.

cleavage the greater the possibility of a realignment of forces into more permanent political groupings. Our task should be, wherever possible, to help those elements engaged in a struggle against the conservative force, to widen the cleavage, to oppose compromise.

As important as the struggle for Civil Rights is now and has been for the recent past it is as nothing compared to the political import of the fight for enfranchisement by the Negroes in the South.

School desegregation, Freedom Rides, Restaurant Sit-Ins, Open Occupancy fights, are merely the precursors of the great battle for the right to vote in the South that is just in its infancy today. I think all of us are agreed that this struggle cannot, and will not cease until it is won. With every victory in this field the chances for change in the relationship of forces in the political arena improve.

Does it make sense today to advocate a Labor Party for those Negroes who will join the voting population of the Country? Does anyone think they will listen today to talk of a Labor Party? They are already making their decision. In Atlanta, Georgia, in the recent mayoralty elections, Negroes were the majority of the voters. They supported the wing of the Democratic Party that was least segregationist and helped elect the Hartsfield candidate.

A leading unionist in Memphis, Tennessee, informs us that of the 120,000 eligible Negro voters in that area, 70,000 have been registered - the result of a concentrated drive by the politically conscious elements led by those in the labor movement. Their goal for which they are already determinedly working is to register all 120,000. They are certain that this action will lay the basis for tremendously increased influence by the Negro population in the politics of Memphis in particular and of Tennessee in general. Their immediate goal is influence in the Democratic Party.

The drive for Negro voting rights in the South is just beginning. It will dwarf the civil rights struggles that have taken place till now. Tomorrow as the choices increase and as the struggle inside the Democratic Party becomes more virulent they will take their place with the labor movement and liberals thruout the Country to rid it of its reactionary and segregationist bloc and the spurious unity of that Party will be shattered. For us to stand aside and to pose the wonderful dream of a Labor Party as the solution to todays political problems will insure our continued sectarian existence.

In the mid-thirties the organization of workers in the mass production industries into industrial unions under the leadership of the C.I.O. was the most significant national development of that entire period. During all that time, and even now, the S.L.P. counterposed its theory of the socialist industrial union to the C.I.O. The success of the S.L.P. will be equalled by the S.P. if in this period we counterpose the sterile grey theory of the Labor Party to the struggle for political realignment.

We too, in the thirties, in the S.P., were busily engaged in

the debate on "The Road to Power" and the fights around that question instead of mobilizing a Party that had substantial strength for up-to-the-neck participation in the C.I.O. struggles. We supported it even adopted resolutions to that effect, but we never mobilized to dive into it.

We must relate our Party to the progressive developments and manifestations which are taking place in the Democratic Party. This does not mean that we identify the Socialist Party with the Democratic Party. It does mean that we associate ourselves with those struggles taking place within it and thereby relate to the reality of life in politics today. The absence of an independent mass working class political party dictates the necessity of working in the arenas of politics that will raise political action to a higher plane and thereby increase the effectiveness and influence of socialists.

WHAT KIND OF REALIGNMENT, AND HOW?

BY Virgil J. Vogel

The so-called realignment policy of the Socialist Party is an abandonment of the goal of an independent electoral instrument in the U.S.; it is a commitment to the proposition that the Democratic Party can ultimately be captured by liberals, purged of its right wing, and presented to the electorate as a genuine alternative to the Republican party or its successor. Behind this are arguments such as this: America is a two party system and will remain so; the Socialist Party cannot be an electoral instrument and there is no substantial sentiment in this country for a labor or third party. To refuse to ally ourselves with the progressive elements in the Democratic Party therefore, it is argued, amounts to political isolation.

The United States is, on the national scene at least, a two party country, and so is Great Britain. In each case, the cause is rooted in the political system. In America it is the single member Congressional district, without proportional representation, and the electoral college, which condemn small parties to futility, so far as the presidency is concerned, and, it appears, for most offices at stake in a national election. In Great Britain it is likewise the single member constituency and the need to get a majority in both the district and in parliament which places a premium on bigness. It is argued by professors that the U.S. and British systems are preferable to that prevailing in PR countries, which are alleged to encourage splinter parties, coalition governments, and instability. Without getting sidetracked in a long discussion, let it be said that this argument is less relevant, if at all, in a country like the U.S. which lacks cabinet government; moreover we actually do have coalition government at least in Congress; as can be seen in the vote tally on any important bill. Only in patronage matters is there any party solidarity.

We have been content to accept these realities without doing anything about it. Proportional representation is not forbidden in the Constitution of the United States, the manner of electing members of Congress being left to the state legislatures. Even state constitutions do not usually prescribe the manner of election, which can be altered by ordinary law. Under a P.R. system an independent party need no longer contend with the old argument that the voters want to vote for a winner. Under P.R., no vote is "thrown away," and since Congress does not organize a government as does the British parliament, and is run by a coalition anyway in all matters except organization and patronage, it makes little difference who has a nominal majority there. Any independent party, even flourishing in a single state, which elected a few members of Congress, could there attract national attention to its program. True, in the past, some third party members have sat in Congress, but these parties were seduced out of existence partly by old party pressures, and partly by the tendency of presidential contests to overshadow all others every four years, causing straight ticket voting, to the

detriment of independent parties. This situation could be partially alleviated by a constitutional amendment to make the electoral vote equivalent to the popular vote, a measure which has much support already. Another necessity if we are to transform the political climate in the U.S. is alteration of ballot requirements in states where they effectively bar new parties from the ballot. These laws were enacted mainly by Democrats who needed a few socialist votes to carry close states. (The 1960 SP vote in Illinois, by the way, was greater than the Kennedy majority in this state!) The Republicans would not be averse to asking them to do so.

The alteration of the political conditions in the U.S. which deter the success of independent political action would be a formidable task indeed, but perhaps less formidable than the capture of a capitalist political party and its transformation into a suitable instrument for effective social change. But let us presume that the political system remains as is for some time to come; what then?

America and England are indeed two-party countries, but it is crucial to understand that it is not ordained in either country that the same two parties must always be the ruling ones. It is not foreordained that neither of the ruling parties is immune to ~~the~~ disenthronement by a new party. In England the Liberals were displaced by the Labor Party, and in America the Whigs were displaced by the Republican Party. True, it happened only once in each place, but how often do you expect what amounts to revolution? It can happen again. These changes, and the manner in which they occurred, were of profound, even revolutionary significance in both countries, and took place in a similar way. It is vitally important for us to understand how and why this happened, and despite the tendency of some comrades to speak scornfully of "ancient history," it might just be possible that we have something to learn from it, which is most relevant to our present strategy.

In both countries the change came about because there were basic social questions which neither major party could take a clear and decisive stand upon because of their amorphous coalition nature. In England these were social and economic questions. If Labor had continued to follow the late 19th century policy of supporting Liberals, there never would have been a Labor Party. Neither could the Labor Party as such have sprung forth full grown from Jove's brow; it could come into being when it did because of the patient ground work of such groups as the Independent Labor Party during the lean years, a courageous little group which never ceased to preach that nothing substantial could come from the electoral policy of the Lib-Labs. The conditions they had to face were not too unlike those we face, even though the process here may be more drawn out. But let it be pointed out, that even though conditions may vary, there may be something instructive in the fact that nowhere on Manitou's green earth has any party representing the old order been successfully transformed into an instrument for basic social change.

Most Socialists are more familiar with English than American history. They do not know the background of the political revolution of the 1850's which resulted in the social revolution of the 1860's. The nominal issue which broke the back of both old parties was the extension of slavery; behind this lay the conflict of antagonistic social

orders. It is sometimes forgotten that the slavocracy before 1854 was generally loyal to the Whig Party, which was a coalition of Southern planters and Northern manufacturers. The Democratic Party was the party of the great unwashed--the small farmers and the urban proletariat--since Jackson. But both parties were so anxious to win elections that neither could take a decisive stand on the great issues posed by slavery. We know that in 1854 the Republican party was organized, at first as a local party operating in a few midwestern states (note bene!), that in 1856 it ran Fremont for president, becoming the second party, (replacing the Whigs) and four years later, aided by a Democratic split, it became the first party, though with a minority of the total vote.

Those events constituted a political revolution, of which the civil war was an aftermath. What occurred was a transfer of power to new social groups. But this remarkable change could not have occurred if the ground had not been plowed and fertilized for thirty years by small and despised abolitionist groups, whose electoral arms were the Liberty and Free Soil Parties. It is crucial to understand this--the great political realignment of the 1850's which both created and brought to power a new major party, could not have occurred when it did without the dogged trailblazing of the small abolitionist parties. (Even the reactionary Know-Nothings contributed to the realignment). The first of the anti-slavery parties, the Liberty Party, was accused of throwing victory to the Whigs in 1840 and to the Democrats in 1844 by siphoning votes away from the defeated party. Its successor, with which it combined, the Free Soil Party, doubtless defeated Democratic Cass and elected Whig Taylor with its free-soil Van Buren, in 1848. They again ran a ticket in 1852, after which they merged with the brand-new Republican Party, a child of their efforts in the best sense of the word. The lesson is that independent action brings realignment, and not foolish efforts to reform old parties. This is the way it came about in both America and Britain.

It has often been said by the professors that the true function of tiny minority parties is to initiate reforms which the big parties adopt when feasible. But the program of the abolitionist parties was so radical in its time that neither existing major party dared to adopt it. We socialists, sometimes pointing with pride to parts of our stolen platform which have become law, must remember that our main goals, the abolition of war and exploitation, are beyond the ability of the present major parties to enact.

In America as in England, the only genuine realignment that has ever taken place, took place through the agency of a brand new major party, not a refurbished old party; a new party brought into being by tireless adherence to the principles of independent political action by courageous minor parties and groups. Their efforts, as ours, must have seemed fruitless even a decade before they brought remarkable changes. Herein lies a lesson for socialists. Let us observe how political change actually takes place, before we plan how to help it along. Our aim indeed is not to perpetuate our sect, but to prepare the way for realignment. But this must be a realignment of people in a broad party of progressive change, and not suicide by drowning in the Democratic morass in hopes of getting realignment therein.

Because of the machinations of the well-oiled and tightly knit "realignment" caucus in Chicago, I shall not be able to present the above ideas at the national convention, for I have been prevented from becoming a delegate. However, I hope there will be other voices from other places not ruled by "democratic centralism" which can wage the good fight.

Note to editors of Hammer and Tongs:

I wish to warn you against the deletion of the last paragraph. I shall wage an untiring campaign to publicize the fact, if it should be deleted.

V.J.V.

The Chicago delegation to the convention is very heterogenous and well-balanced delegation. The last paragraph of Virgil's otherwise article vindicates the judgement shown by the membership in electing several delegates with same views on political action as Virgil, while defeating Virgil himself.

Saul Mendelson

Virgil Vogel's completely baseless charge that he was prevented from being elected a delegate to the National Convention by the "machinations of a well-oiled and tightly knit 'realignment' caucus in Chicago" indicate, as does his article on realignment, that he is living in another world. For the records, and it is something that Comrade Vogel knows very well, the comrades committed to a "realignment" position are a small minority of the Illinois delegation.

Max Weinrib

BUILDING THE SOCIALIST PARTY

A Resolution on Political Perspectives

Given the absence of a mass Socialist Party as exists in most other countries, it is imperative for American socialists to state our goals so that all who come into contact with us appreciate the importance of socialism and socialists. This is the basis on which the Party can recruit and influence American life.

Socialists are fundamentally concerned that society be so reorganized that relations between men and the utilization of technology will be established on the principles of social justice and the fullest application of democratic procedures. We are opponents of any government which uses either private property or nationalized property as the foundation of social inequality or oppression of another nation. Therefore, socialists are basically opposed to the domestic and foreign policies of both the capitalist and communist countries.

The threat of atomic destruction points more clearly than ever to the necessity of the socialist reorganization of society. However, socialists do not stand aside from those struggles which seek immediate improvements in the lives of human beings within the framework of the existing class society. Socialists support such struggles precisely because our movement has no aim other than the betterment of the conditions of humanity.

American socialists find their natural allies among the members of the organizations of social protest, including the peace, civil rights, civil liberties and labor movements. Along with these movements socialists find much to criticize in the actions of the Kennedy administration. Socialists predict that as the movements of social protest increase, expand, and unify their activities in the next immediate period in the United States, many people will begin to see that the greatest single barrier to social equality and the abolition of war is our present government, whether it be controlled by Democrats or Republicans. Therefore, socialists anticipate a process of politicization among the members of the organizations of social protest which will bring them ever closer to the socialist viewpoint. It is with confidence in this inevitable development of social consciousness that the Socialist Party organizes its activities, participates in the organizations of social protest, and calls on Americans to support socialism and the Socialist Party.

There are two immediate problems facing the Socialist Party. Exactly how do socialists work with and within the progressive movements of our time? Secondly, what is to be the attitude of socialists toward the ferment which develops today within the major capitalist parties precisely because there is, as yet, no mass American Socialist Party providing an immediate political alternative?

Socialists participate within the organizations of social protest not only by being among the most conscientious activists but by distinctively standing forward as the spokesmen for the ending of all social inequalities. Where people striving for social justice are not adequately represented by their leaders -- wherever there is bureaucratization or corruption within the organizations of social protest (as particularly within the labor movement), or where there is total lack of organization -- the Socialist Party strives to become the champion of all oppressed groups who do not find spokesmen in existing

society. This is how political movements grow -- by seeing the existence of deep, unsatisfied social needs and seeking to satisfy these needs by patient, practical work.

The fact that socialists find their major arena of work within the organizations of social protest obviously does not exclude a deep concern with those divisions in the major capitalist parties which occur precisely because of increasing protest. We have every interest in adding to the clarification of national politics by seeing that the labor-liberal-minority element within the Democratic Party, for example crystallize their opposition to reactionary policies and practices. On the other hand, as an independent party with a program, views, and activities of our own, we must take great care clearly to distinguish ourselves from liberal apologists for capitalism.

The Convention of the Socialist Party thereby declares that in all cases where a non-party candidate for elective office is presumably making a real break with the bureaucratic machinery and political attitudes of the capitalist parties, the official attitude of the Party between National Conventions will be determined only by the National Committee.

The Socialist Party contains within its organization a broad spectrum of democratic socialist views. The Party encourages membership by all who believe in the necessity for a more free and just society. Each tendency within the Socialist Party is guaranteed the fullest freedom to win the majority of the Party to its position, to recruit to its position and thereby determine party policy. Precisely because the Socialist Party has this broad party structure no individual or local organization can presume to speak for the entire national party in the important area of attitude toward non-socialist organizations and candidates. To permit unchecked support to other political organizations would transform our legitimately broad and unified organization into a meaningless sect without reason for independent existence.

The Socialist Party has a long tradition of participation in the electoral arena in its own name. The Party reaffirms that such electoral activity remains one of the objectives of the Party, although the participation in any particular campaign must be weighed not only by what is desirable but by what is practical. In the absence of electoral activity in the name of the Socialist Party, the continuation of a party publishing program making clear the need for a strong, independent Socialist Party is more necessary than ever. There is a great political vacuum in the United States, particularly on the left, and the Party must make all efforts to have its literature provide the education and propaganda for socialism so sorely needed in American life.

Socialists well appreciate that in the United States today there is little expectation of an immediate mass radicalization which would rapidly produce a mass socialist organization. Socialists must rather be prepared for the probability of continued extended work in mass organizations and educational-propagandistic work to rally active membership to the local party organizations. However, the great danger today is that, in the desire to support others who seem to be moving in a progressive direction, the party lose its own identity and sense of purpose. With this danger in mind, the Socialist Party reaffirms its belief that the Party can participate best in the many areas of political activity by remaining the voice of American socialism and the traditional opponent of capitalist ideology and politics.

Bill Briggs and Arthur Kunkin, Los Angeles